

# Partnerships for Student Achievement Through Technology

**(PSATT)**



**Competitive Technology Grants for High Need School Districts**



**Linda McCulloch, Superintendent**  
**Montana Office of Public Instruction**  
**PO Box 202501**  
**Helena, Montana 59620-2501**  
**[www.opi.mt.gov](http://www.opi.mt.gov)**

# Table of Contents

Timeline .....	1
General Application Information .....	2
Program Specific Information	
Goals and Purposes of ESEA Title II, Part D .....	3
Eligible Applicant Districts .....	3-4
Bonus Points .....	4-5
Partnerships .....	5-6
Funding .....	6
Approved Use of Funds .....	6-7
Minimum Grant Score.....	7
Relevant Research .....	7
Professional Development .....	8
Technology Plan .....	8
Technology Plan Requirements .....	9
Goals and Objectives from the OPI Ed Tech Technology Plan.....	10
Children’s Internet Protection Act (CIPA) .....	11
Nonpublic School Participation .....	11
Application Format .....	11
Application Elements .....	11-14
Goals and Objectives .....	11-12
Strategies and Timelines .....	12
Evaluation Plan .....	12-13
Technology Plans .....	13
Alignment: Five-Year Comprehensive Education Plan	
ESEA Title II, Part D (Ed Tech) Formula Funds and Technology Plans .....	13
Budget .....	13-14
Ed Tech Partnerships for Student Achievement Through Technology Award Recipient Meetings .....	14
Cover Page/Signature Page .....	15
Technology Plan-Page Reference Cover Sheets .....	16-18
Application Evaluation Rubric .....	19-21
Technology Plan Evaluation Rubric .....	22-24
Score Compilation Worksheet for OPI Use .....	25
Recommended Resources .....	26
Prospective Grant Technology Plan Reader Instructions.....	27
Prospective Grant Technology Plan Reader Nomination Form.....	28
Eligibility Spreadsheet .....	29-35

**Partnerships for Student Achievement  
Through Technology**

---

**Competitive Grants 2005-06, 2006-07**

---

**Funded by:  
Enhancing Education Through Technology (Ed Tech)  
Title II, Part D of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act  
as Amended by the  
No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001**

TIMELINE	
February 8, 2005	Application posted on the Office of Public Instruction (OPI) Web site and announcements sent to all LEAs
April 18, 2005	Applications postmarked by this date or received by the OPI by 5:00 p.m. on April 18, 2005
April 20, 2005 - May 15, 2005	Application Review Process
April 21-22, 2005	Application Review Process -Technology Plan Review* *Nomination form to be a Technology Plan Reader is enclosed
May 16, 2005	Grant Awards Announced
June To be determined	Mandatory Project Director and Partner Meeting OPI 9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.
July 1, 2005	First year of project funds become available to awardees
September 30, 2006	Last date to obligate funds (Year 1 funds)
This is a federal program and sub-grant reporting dates and requirements are subject to change as federal requirements change.	

## General Application Information

### *Who do we contact at the Office of Public Instruction for assistance?*

Michael Hall, Specialist  
Telephone: (406) 444-4422  
Fax: (406) 444-1373  
E-mail: [mhall@mt.gov](mailto:mhall@mt.gov)

or

Lorraine Burns, Administrative Assistant  
Telephone: (406) 444-1852  
Fax: (406) 444-1373  
E-mail: [lburns@mt.gov](mailto:lburns@mt.gov)

### *When are the applications due?*

Applications must be postmarked by April 18, 2005 or received by the OPI 5:00 p.m. on April 18, 2005.

Applications should be sent by certified mail.

Return an original of the application and each technology plan and an additional three (3) copies of the application and each technology plan (total of 4 each) to:

Michael Hall, Specialist  
Office of Public Instruction  
PO Box 202501  
Helena, MT 59620-2501

### *Can the applications be submitted electronically?*

No. Original signatures are required on the application and electronic messaging may fail; thus, no electronic submissions can be accepted (e.g., NO facsimiles, e-mails, disks or flash drives).

**Partnerships for Student Achievement Through Technology  
Competitive Grants 2005-07  
Program Specific Information**

**Goals and Purposes of ESEA Title II, Part D**

***What is the main focus of the Ed Tech competitive and formula funding?***

The main focus is upon improving student academic achievement through the effective use of technology in teaching and learning. The competitive grants achieve that focus through the establishment of regional technology networks to assist targeted school districts.

The proposals must focus upon technology literacy and infusion (integration) relevant to the student academic achievement needs of the Prime Applicant District and the participating eligible partner districts. For example: an application may focus upon Reading and Mathematics as the main content areas for professional development and technology infusion as both are the focus of the NCLB legislation as well as districts' Five-Year Comprehensive Education Plans.

***What are the goals of the Enhancing Education Through Technology competitive funding?***

- 1) To improve student academic achievement through the effective use of technology in teaching and learning,
- 2) To improve the technology literacy of teachers and students, and
- 3) To improve the capacity of teachers to effectively and efficiently integrate technology into their curriculum and instruction.

***What is the specific focus for the Enhancing Education Through Technology competitive funding in Montana?***

- I. Partnerships to improve teaching and student learning are the focus for the competitive funding in Montana. Partnerships are a focus of the enabling law as a method to assist low-performing school districts to improve student academic achievement through the effective use of technology in teaching and learning.
- II. The partnerships (see "Partnerships" below) join high poverty/high need schools with a technologically proficient mentor selected from available mentors and a technologically proficient mentor (faculty member) from a teacher education program at a college or university to improve teaching and learning through the effective use of technology in teaching and learning with the focus on improving the student academic achievement of the students in the high poverty/high need schools.
- III. The partnership grants, funded for up to two years based upon performance, are intended to form the basis of a "regional technology network" for the effective use of technology in teaching and learning to improve student academic achievement. Regional technology service network activities are to be developed in the first year of the grant operation and begin implementation no later than the start of the second year. It is expected that the services of the networks will expand as the network develops.

Regional Networks disseminate information and provide service to other identified high poverty/high need districts (see "Eligible Applicant Districts" below) in their region to assist them in the effective integration of technology for the improvement of student learning, and, disseminate information and provide service to districts in the region that requires or desires assistance (districts are encouraged to use their Ed Tech formula funds and/or local funds to purchase the service from the partnership network). Regional Networks may also assist districts with group purchasing of technology and cooperative efforts involving professional development.

**Eligible Applicant Districts**

***What are the grant eligibility requirements?***

The NCLB legislation specifies that only Local Education Agencies (LEAs) eligible for the Title II, Part D program with the highest number or percentages of children from families with incomes below the poverty line **and** are identified for improvement or corrective action under the ESEA Title I regulations or have a substantial

need for technology and have not “redirected the use of” their Ed Tech funds under the authority of ESEA Title VI, may apply for the competitive funds under this program.

Districts may participate/apply in only one proposal. Consult the attached district eligibility spreadsheet for district specific information.

**Eligible Applicant Districts**—Title II, Part D, districts that meet the poverty and ESEA Title I qualifications or the poverty and technology need requirements may apply. The lead applicant district is referred to as the “Prime Applicant.”

**Partnerships**—Prime Applicant Districts must partner with at least one:

- ✓ Eligible applicant district (other than an elementary or high school district associated with the prime applicant district);
- ✓ Technology Mentor (see criteria enclosed);
- ✓ Technology Mentor (faculty member) from a teacher education program at a college or university (see criteria enclosed); or
- ✓ Additional partnerships with “eligible applicant districts” are strongly encouraged.

Eligible Applicant Districts are identified by a “YES” in column 9 of the district eligibility spreadsheet.

**NOTE:** Many other districts will qualify as “Eligible Applicant Districts” that are not currently indicated as such on the eligibility spreadsheet. Potentially eligible districts are listed in column nine of the eligibility spreadsheet as “undetermined”. The Office of Public Instruction does not have access to technology need data from the districts with which to make a final eligibility determination. Districts with high poverty may be able to demonstrate their technology need through the use of data from the Taking A Good Look At Instructional Technology (TAGLIT). TAGLIT data must have been collected with which to make final eligibility determinations within the 12 months prior to the April 18, 2005 application deadline. See criteria and further information below.

**Districts seeking to document their “substantial need for technology” in order to become eligible to apply as a Prime Applicant District or to be an “eligible applicant district” in a partnership must:**

- Be among those LEAs in the state with the highest numbers or percentages of children from families with incomes below the poverty line (see Eligibility Spreadsheet attached).
- Demonstrate technology needs utilizing data from the Taking A Good Look At Instructional Technology (TAGLIT) that has been collected within the 12 months prior to the April 18, 2005 application deadline. To qualify, districts must have a composite score below three on at least three of the following TAGLIT sections:
  - Teachers’ Tech Use - Basic Skills (Table 2b.2 - Teachers data)
  - Teachers’ Tech Use - Multimedia Tools (Table 2b.3 - Teachers data)
  - Teachers’ Tech Use - Communication Tools (Table 2b.4 - Teachers data)
  - Teachers’ Tech Use - Research/Problem-Solving Tools (Table 2b.5 -Teachers data)
- Districts seeking to demonstrate their “substantial need for technology” are encouraged to submit documentation to the Office of Public Instruction for determination of status **before** the grant is written and submitted.
- Districts that currently participate in the TAGLIT through the Bill Gates Leadership grant will use their current data; other districts can sign up to use the TAGLIT free of charge by contacting Liz Cunningham, TAGLIT coordinator, (888) 401-6950. The TAGLIT must be completed before the submission of the grant application.

## **Bonus Points**

### **Ed Tech Formula Grants**

As required by the enabling NCLB statute, high poverty districts (Census data) that are awarded a formula grant allocation less than the average of the allocations received by high poverty districts in the state, must be given a

priority in the competition. Identified districts will receive bonus points in the competition (see attached Eligibility Spreadsheet for district specific information). The bonus points of all districts involved in a proposal will be added to the final proposal review score.

### **Professional Development Priority**

Proposals are required to allocate a minimum of 25 percent of its grant funds for professional development activities. However, there is a grant priority for professional development and grants allocating greater than 50 percent of awarded funds for professional development will receive bonus points in the competition. Review the attached grant proposal rubric for details.

## **Partnerships**

### ***What are the Partnership requirements?***

Each application submitted by a prime applicant (lead eligible applicant district) must, at a minimum, include four partners. The partnership must include the prime applicant, an eligible applicant district (other than an elementary or high school district associated with the prime applicant district), a technologically proficient mentor, and a technologically proficient mentor who is a member of the faculty from a teacher education program (Montana higher education system preferred). The purpose of the partnership is to assist the high poverty/high need districts to effectively integrate technology and improve student academic achievement and develop the regional technology service network. Additional partnerships with “eligible applicant districts” are strongly encouraged.

Successful grant recipient districts may enter into business relationships with other service providers to obtain services required for the successful completion of the grant objectives.

**Technologically Proficient** mentors (mentors-at-large) eligible to be partners are those with demonstrated 1) skills, knowledges, willingness and commitment to assist the applicant district and assist in the development of the regional network, 2) capacity to assist the applicant district and 3) performance documented that can demonstrate that teachers in its schools, or that its interventions with schools are effective at integrating technology and proven teaching practices into instruction, based on a review of relevant research, and that the integration results in improvement in classroom instruction and in helping students meet challenging academic standards. Technology proficient mentors’ technological proficiency can be demonstrated through activities/strategies such as:

- Participation in, or the creation of, researched and validated technology based professional development programs,
- Demonstrated proficiency with successful technology infusion (integration) across the curriculum, or
- Demonstrated proficiency with developing technology mentors, or data driven professional development models.

The quality of Technology Proficient Mentors will be rated in the application process. See the “Quality of Technology Mentors” section on the proposal evaluation rubric.

**Technologically proficient mentors from the faculty of teacher education programs at higher education institutions** eligible to be partners are those with demonstrated 1) performance that verifies their ability to assist teachers in effectively integrating technology and proven teaching practices into instruction, based on a review of relevant research, and that the integration results in improvement in classroom instruction and in helping students meet challenging academic standards, 2) capacity to assist the applicant district, and 3) willingness and commitment to assist the applicant district and assist in the development of the regional network.

Technology proficient mentors from teacher education programs at higher education institutions may demonstrate proficiency and ability to assist districts through activities/strategies such as:

- Participation in, or the creation of, researched and validated technology based programs through such federally funded programs as Preparing Teachers of Tomorrow to Teach with Technology (PT3) grants, Technology Innovation Grants or other sources,
- Participation in, or the creation of, researched and validated technology based professional development programs,

- Demonstrated proficiency with successful technology infusion (integration) across the curriculum, or
- Demonstrated proficiency with developing technology mentors, or data driven professional development models.

Higher education institutions must be in full compliance with the reporting requirements of section 207 (f) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, and not be identified by the state as low performing under that act.

The quality of Technology Proficient Mentors will be rated in the application process. See the “Quality of Technology Mentors” section of the proposal evaluation rubric.

## **Funding**

### ***What is the source of the funds for the grants?***

The Partnerships for Student Achievement Through Technology grants are funded through ESEA Title II, Part D - Enhancing Education Through Technology (Ed Tech) of the Elementary and Secondary Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. As possible, the grants are to be equitably distributed between urban and rural school districts.

### ***How much funding is available for the grants?***

Congress has approved \$1.5 million for Montana during the current grant year. Funds for the second year of the grants have been reduced 28 percent by Congress making approximately \$1.1 million available for year two activities.

### ***How many grants can be funded?***

It is anticipated that approximately six partnership grants to develop regional technology service centers will be funded. It is anticipated that the grants will range in size from \$175,000 to \$250,000. Budget items and amounts will be negotiated with recipients.

### ***What is the funding period for the Ed Tech program grants?***

The Partnerships for Student Achievement Through Technology grants are two-year grants with the second year of funding contingent upon the successful implementation of grant activities and upon availability of federal funds.

### ***What is the Funding Timeline?***

Grant funds for the first year of funding are available July 1, 2005 through September 30, 2006. No budget year extensions or carry over of funds are permitted.

## **Approved Use of Funds**

### ***Must an Ed Tech grant recipient use a portion of its funds to support specific types of activities?***

Yes.

Each Ed Tech grant recipient must use at least 25 percent of its funds to provide ongoing, sustained, and intensive, high-quality, job embedded professional development. The recipient must provide professional development based on a review of relevant research, designed to achieve the grant objectives, in the integration of advanced technologies, including emerging technologies, into curricula and instruction and in using those technologies to create new learning environments. **However, there is a grant priority for professional development and grants allocating greater than 50 percent of awarded funds for professional development will receive bonus points in the competition.** Review the attached grant proposal rubric for details.

Note: An indirect rate may only be assessed by the prime applicant district. (Districts must have applied for, and received the indirect rate in order to build it into their budgets. For information on indirect rates, contact Jim Oberembt at the OPI (406) 444-1257.



### ***What other activities might a grant recipient support with Ed Tech funds?***

In implementing activities to achieve the grant objectives, a recipient of Ed Tech funds may support activities such as:

- Increasing accessibility to technology, particularly through public-private partnerships, with special emphasis on accessibility for high-need schools.
- Adapting or expanding applications of technology to enable teachers to increase student academic achievement, including technology literacy, through teaching practices that are based on the review of relevant research and through use of innovative distance learning strategies.
- Implementing proven and effective courses and curricula that include integrated technology and that are designed to help students reach challenging academic standards.
- Using technology to promote parental involvement and foster communication among students, parents, and teachers about curricula, assignments, and assessments.
- Preparing one or more teachers in schools as technology leaders who will assist other teachers,
- Enhancing existing technology and acquiring new technology to support education reforms and to improve student achievement.
- Acquiring connectivity linkages, resources, and services for use by students and school personnel to improve academic achievement.
- Implementing enhanced performance measurement systems to determine the effectiveness of education technology programs funded with Ed Tech funds.
- Developing, enhancing, or implementing information technology courses.

Note: an indirect rate may only be assessed by the prime applicant district. (Districts must have applied for, and received the indirect rate in order to build it into their budgets.)

### **Minimum Grant Score**

Grants recommended for funding must score 70 percent or greater in the competition. Grants accepted for funding may require program and budget revisions before final approval and funding is released.

### **Relevant Research**

#### ***What are the requirements for the use of “relevant research” in the application process and operation of grant programs?***

Applicants are required to summarize and cite the “relevant research” that supports strategies employed in the proposal for integrating technology and improving student academic achievement.

Review criteria will focus upon:

- Clear identification of relevant research (technology integration, teaching strategies, professional development strategies, etc.),
- What the research indicates about the potential impact and effectiveness of the strategies, and
- The relationship between the researched strategies and the desired outcomes.

#### **What is “relevant research”?**

Defined in section 9101(37) of the NCLB act, scientifically based research involves the application of rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures to obtain reliable and valid knowledge relevant to education activities and programs. For assistance in locating appropriate research, review the Web sites listed in the Recommended Resources section below.

## **Professional Development**

### ***What are the requirements for professional development?***

Professional development provided through Ed Tech funds is required to be ongoing, sustained, intensive, job embedded, and high quality. The professional development provided must be based on a review of relevant research.

A good source for information and research on professional development is The National Staff Development Council via the Web site at: <http://www.nsdc.org/>.

**NOTE: It is required that a minimum of 25 percent of grant funds be allocated for professional development. However, there is a grant priority on professional development and grants allocating greater than 50 percent of awarded funds to professional development will receive bonus points in the competition. Review the grant proposal rubric for details.**

## **Technology Plan**

### ***What are the technology plan requirements for districts involved in an application for the Partnerships for Student Achievement Through Technology grants?***

Under the NCLB legislation, any district that receives Ed Tech funds through the formula or the competitive portion of ESEA Title II, Part D, must have a new or updated long-range technology plan that is consistent with the objectives of the OPI Ed Tech technology plan (see OPI Ed Tech plan goals and objectives below) and that addresses the statutory local plan requirements (see Technology Plan Evaluation Rubric attached). All districts that have received formula funds under ESEA Title II, Part D through the consolidated application for federal funds have signed a statement of assurances to the OPI that the local plan has been updated to meet the requirements.

The Technology Plan Evaluation Rubric enclosed is structured to match the “Montana Integrated Technology Plan Framework” posted on the OPI Web site at <http://www.opi.state.mt.us/EdTech/Index.html>. The framework integrates the technology plan requirements for the ESEA Title II, Part D –Enhancing Education Through Technology and E-Rate programs. It is recommended that districts submitting technology plans as a part of this competition structure their plans to match the evaluation rubric.

For the purposes of the Partnerships for Student Achievement Through Technology competitive grants, every district that is included in a grant proposal must submit their technology plan for review (see Technology Plan Evaluation Rubric for details on requirements). Each plan submitted must include the “Technology Plan-Page Reference Cover Sheets” on which page numbers referencing plan sections are recorded. All technology plans will be reviewed and the scores obtained in the review will be utilized to obtain the total score for the proposal.

**ENHANCING EDUCATION THROUGH TECHNOLOGY (Ed Tech)  
ESEA TITLE II, PART D  
TECHNOLOGY PLAN REQUIREMENTS**

All recipients of Ed Tech funds must have a technology plan that is in compliance with the following federal regulations. Districts receiving Ed Tech formula awards have signed a statement of assurances to the Office of Public Instruction (OPI) that the requirements have been met. Districts applying for Ed Tech competitive funds must submit technology plans as part of the application process. Each plan must contain the following elements as required by federal regulations. It is recommended that districts submitting technology plans as a part of this competition structure their plans to match the Technology Plan Evaluation Rubric enclosed.

- A. A description of how the applicant will use ESEA Title II, Part D funds to improve student academic achievement, including the technology literacy of all students, and to improve the capacity of teachers to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction.
- B. The applicant's specific goals for using advanced technology to improve student academic achievement aligned with state content and performance standards.
- C. The steps that will be taken to ensure that all students and teachers have increased access to educational technology, including how the LEA will use funds under ESEA Title II, Part D with funds from other sources to ensure that:
  - 1. Students in high-poverty and high-needs schools will have access to technology, and
  - 2. Teachers are prepared to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction.
- D. A description of how the applicant will identify and promote curricula and teaching strategies that integrate technology effectively into curriculum instruction, based on a review of relevant research, leading to improvements in student academic achievement.
- E. Provide ongoing, sustained, professional development for district staff to further the effective use of technology in the classroom or library media center (a minimum of 25 percent of grant funds received must be used for professional development).
- F. A description of the type and costs of technologies to be acquired under this funding including services, software and digital curricula, and including specific provisions for interoperability among components of such technologies.
- G. A description of how the activities provided with funds from this part will be coordinated with funds available from other federal, state and local sources.
- H. A description of how technology will be integrated into curricula and instruction and a timeline for such integration.
- I. A description of how the applicant will encourage the development and utilization of innovative strategies for the delivery of specialized or rigorous academic courses and curricula through the use of technology, including distance learning technologies, particularly for areas that would not otherwise have access to such courses and curricula due to geographical isolation or insufficient resources.
- J. A description of how the applicant will ensure the effective use of technology to promote parental involvement and increase communication with parents, including how parents will be informed of the technology being applied in their child's education so that the parents are able to reinforce at home the instruction their child receives at school.
- K. A description of how programs will be developed, where applicable, in collaboration with adult literacy service providers to maximize the use of technology.
- L. A description of the process and accountability measures that will be used to evaluate the extent to which activities funded are effective in integrating technology into the curricula and instruction, increasing the ability of teachers to teach, and enabling students to meet challenging state academic content and performance standards.
- M. A description of the supporting resources (services, software and other electronically delivered learning materials, and print resources) that will be acquired to ensure successful and effective uses of technology.
- N. A description of how the local technology plan has been aligned with the goals and objectives of the OPI Ed Tech Technology plan.

## 2005-2007 Enhancing Education Through Technology – Competitive Funds Application

### Goals and Objectives from the OPI Ed Tech Technology Plan

Applicants must address each of the measurable objectives. Each strategy designed to meet local needs must directly support one or more of the objectives. Baseline and/or growth data must be collected annually.

### Strategies for Improving Academic Achievement

#### Goal Number 1

**Integrating Technology into Curriculum and Instruction:** All Montana teachers will be effective and efficient integrators of technology into their curriculum and instruction.

Measurable Objective 1.1: One hundred percent (100%) of district teachers will rate themselves as a “3” or better as measured by the Teachers’ Technology Use in Teaching and Learning section of the Taking A Good Look at Instructional Technology (TAGLIT) by Spring 2007.

#### Goal Number2

**Integrating Technology into Curriculum and Instruction:** All Montana teachers will know, understand and be able to teach the content knowledge required by the Montana Technology Content and Performance Standards for students.

Measurable Objective 2.1: One hundred percent (100%) of Montana teachers K-12 will know, understand and be able to teach the content knowledge required by the Montana Technology Content and Performance Standard 3 – Students use a variety of technologies for Communication -by Spring 2007 as measured by the Eisenhower Teacher Self-Assessment and Professional Development Study, standard 3 subsection (available from the OPI).

Measurable Objective 2.2: One hundred percent (100%) of Montana teachers K-12 will know, understand and be able to teach the content knowledge required by the Montana Technology Content and Performance Standard 6 – Students apply technological abilities and knowledge to construct new personal understanding -by Spring 2007 as measured by the Eisenhower Teacher Self-Assessment and Professional Development Study, standard 6 subsection (available from the OPI).

Measurable Objective 2.3: One hundred percent (100%) of Montana teachers K-12 will know, understand and be able to teach the content knowledge required by the Montana Technology Content and Performance Standard 2 – Students use a variety of Technologies to Enhance Productivity -by Spring 2007 as measured by the Eisenhower Teacher Self-Assessment and Professional Development Study, standard 2 subsection (available from the OPI).

#### Goal Number 3

**Increasing the Ability of Teachers to Teach Utilizing Technology:** All Montana teachers and principals will be technologically proficient.

Measurable Objective 3.1: One hundred percent (100%) of district teachers will rate themselves as a “3” or better as measured by the Teachers’ Technology Skills section (basic tools, multimedia tools, communication tools, research/problem-solving tools) of the Taking A Good Look at Instructional Technology (TAGLIT) by Spring 2007.

#### Goal Number 4

**Enabling Students to meet Challenging State Standards:** All Montana students will be technologically proficient by eighth grade.

Measurable Objective 4.1: One hundred percent (100%) of students will rate themselves as a “3” or better as measured by the Students’ Technology Skills section (basic tools, multimedia tools, communication tools, research/problem-solving tools) of the Taking A Good Look at Instructional Technology (TAGLIT) by Spring 2007.

## **Children's Internet Protection Act (CIPA)**

### ***What are the grant requirements related to CIPA?***

Districts must certify compliance via one of the following three avenues:

- 1) District receives E-Rate funding and has certified CIPA compliance to the E-Rate program, **OR**
- 2) District does not participate in the E-Rate program, however, hereby certifies that it is CIPA compliant, **OR**
- 3) District does not participate in the E-Rate program and the CIPA requirements do not apply because no funds are used to purchase computers used to access the Internet, or to pay the direct costs associated with accessing the Internet.

Districts have certified CIPA compliance through signing the Common Assurances for Federal Programs in spring 2002.

## **Nonpublic School Participation**

### ***What does the equitable participation provisions of the law require grant applicants to do?***

Applicant districts and partner districts must engage in timely and meaningful consultation with appropriate nonpublic school (home schools and private schools) officials during the design and development of programs and continue the consultation throughout the implementation of these programs. Therefore, for the Ed Tech competitive awards, the consultation must begin during the development of the local grant proposals.

Nonpublic schools must meet the same eligibility requirements that participating districts meet. High poverty and high technology need status must be determined for participation.

## **Application Format**

### **What are the format requirements of the Ed Tech Partnerships for Student Achievement Through Technology grant?**

Applications may not exceed the total page limit of 30 pages, and must

- ✓ use half inch or larger margins,
- ✓ use Times New Roman, 12-point type,
- ✓ be double spaced, and
- ✓ include no more than 30 lines of type per page.

**Applications that do not meet format requirements will not be read nor rated.**

The following items **DO NOT** count against the page length requirement:

- ✓ Grant Application Cover page/Signature Page (see below),
- ✓ Technology plans and the Technology Plan-Page Reference Cover Sheets,
- ✓ Technology need documentation from school district(s),
- ✓ Documentation of the Quality of Key Personnel for the Internal Evaluation, and
- ✓ Documentation of the Quality of Key Technology Mentors.

## **Application Elements**

### ***What are the required elements of the application?***

#### **Goals and Objectives**

- 1) The **Goals and Objectives** for the ESEA Title II, Part D formula and competitive programs are aligned with the federal No Child Left Behind legislation through the Office of Public Instruction's Ed Tech Technology Plan. Applicants must address each of the measurable objectives through the local design, implementation and evaluation of appropriate strategies. Each strategy designed to meet local needs must directly support one or more of the objectives. Baseline and/or growth data must be collected annually. Include the baseline data at the time of the grant submission. Once the grants are in operation, further baseline data may be collected.
- 2) Applicants may add an additional measurable objective if it is determined that local needs cannot be met within the structure of the given objectives. Additional objectives must be consistent with the purposes of the Ed Tech program.

- 3) It is recommended that the goals and objectives of the proposal focus upon technology infusion relevant to the student academic achievement needs of the prime applicant district. Reading and mathematics are the main focus of the NCLB legislation as well as district Five-Year Comprehensive Education Plans.

### **Strategies and Timeline**

#### **Strategies must:**

- 1) Integrate technology into curriculum and instruction,
- 2) Increase the ability of teachers to teach utilizing technology,
- 3) Enable students to meet challenging state standards,
- 4) Provide high quality, long-term, sustained, job embedded professional development (emphasis is away from one-time, short term awareness type activities),
- 5) Include a summary of relevant research that supports the proposed strategies. (What does the research indicate about the potential impact and/or effectiveness of the strategies?), and
- 6) Target improvement of student academic achievement.

#### **Appropriate strategies may include:**

- Preparing an administrator and one or more teachers in a school/district to serve as technology leaders,
- Developing technology integration specialists in districts,
- Ongoing release time and support for administrators and teachers to integrate technology across the curriculum,
- Improving student academic achievement through research supported uses of technology,
- Providing student-centered, inquiry-based, technology supported professional development and supporting the implementation in classrooms (Project Based Learning and others),
- Implementing programs such as: Intel Teach to the Future, Gen Y, or other research-supported technology based programs documented to improve the integration of technology into curriculum and instruction and lead to improvement in student academic achievement.

#### **Strategies for the Development of the Regional Technology Networks**

Include strategies and a timeline that indicate how the grant through its partnerships will develop an infrastructure to become a regional technology network for technology services to districts in the region. Include information on:

- 1) How the partners will work together to develop the technology network concept to meet the goals of the Ed Tech program,
- 2) The educational technology services the network would provide,
- 3) How the network would focus upon the high need districts targeted for funding under the Ed Tech program, and
- 4) How the network would provide service to other districts in the region, and how the network would evaluate and refine its performance.

Regional Technology Network activities are to be developed in the first year of the grant operation and begin implementation no later than the start of the second year.

### **Evaluation Plan – Internal and External**

Describe how the effectiveness of the strategies will be evaluated, including and going beyond the use of the baseline and growth data collected as an ongoing activity of the grant. Data collection must be provided to allow for the analysis of progress toward improved student academic achievement, increase in teacher skill and technology use, and other variables as appropriate to the grant and related school improvement programs. Focus upon the:

- Integration of technology into curriculum and instruction,
- Increase in the ability of teachers to teach utilizing technology,
- Increase in ability of students to meet challenging state standards,

- Provision of high quality, long-term, sustained, job embedded professional development (emphasis is away from one-time, short term awareness type activities),
- Relevant research that supports the proposed strategies,
- Improvement of student academic achievement, and
- Replicability of the grant strategies in other locations.

Allocate the grant budget to include the costs of Internal Evaluation as appropriate to the scope of the task. Internal evaluation is intended to be both formative and summative in nature. Describe how the evaluation information will guide the ongoing development of the grant operation. An internal evaluation report is required to be submitted to the OPI by November 15, 2006 covering the first year of the grant operation, and by November 15, 2007 covering the final year of the grant operation.

Five percent of the total grant request must be set aside for evaluation by an outside evaluator named by the state. The outside evaluator will work with the internal evaluator, the local evaluation plan and collect data for the statewide evaluation of the Ed Tech program.

## **Technology Plans**

Every eligible school district participating in a PSATT grant request must submit their technology plan with the grant proposal. All technology plans will be scored and the score will be included in the overall score for the grant proposal (see rubric enclosed).

LEAs and eligible local entities must have long-range technology plans that are consistent with the objectives of the OPI Ed Tech Technology plan. LEAs must develop strategies for improving student academic achievement through the effective use of technology in classrooms, including improving the capacity of teachers to integrate technology into curricula and instruction. Furthermore, they must set specific goals, aligned with state standards, for using advanced technology to improve student academic achievement.

To help ensure accountability for Ed Tech funds, LEAs and eligible local entities must also develop a process and accountability measures that they will use to evaluate the extent to which activities funded under the program are effective in:

- 1) Integrating technology into curricula and instruction;
- 2) Increasing the ability of teachers to teach; and
- 3) Enabling students to meet challenging state standards.

### ***What are the requirements for aligning to the district's Five-Year Comprehensive Education Plan, ESEA Title II, Part D formula funds and the local technology plans?***

Each district participating in a grant proposal must detail how the grant strategies align with, and help to achieve, the goals of their Five-Year Comprehensive Education Plan (<http://www.opi.state.mt.us/5YearPlan/Index.html>) required by the Board of Public Education, their ESEA Title II, Part D (Ed Tech) formula funding and the district technology plan.

## **Budget**

A minimum of 25 percent of the total grant funds must be allocated toward professional development. Proposals allocating greater than 50 percent for professional development will receive bonus points in the competition.

Five percent of the total budget request must be set aside for evaluation by an outside evaluator to be named by the state.

An indirect cost rate may only be taken by the prime applicant district.

No funds received through this grant program may supplant local funds.

Note: Districts awarded ESEA Title II, Part D formula grant funds through the consolidated application for federal funds have signed a statement of assurances certifying that funds received under this part will supplement, not supplant, state and local funds.

### ***What information must be included in the Budget Justification?***

The budget justification must include, and clearly delineate, the costs associated with implementing the proposed strategies, required meetings and evaluation costs. Identify the linkage between each budget item and the strategy

that it supports and provide necessary information to justify the expenditure. Clearly articulate the professional development expenditures and classify expenditures into the three general categories of: 1) Salaries and Benefits, 2) Operating, and 3) Equipment.

NOTE: It is required that a minimum of 25 percent of grant funds be allocated to professional development. However, there is a grant priority for professional development and grants allocating greater than 50 percent of awarded funds to professional development will receive bonus points in the competition. Review the grant proposal evaluation rubric for details.

#### **Ed Tech Partnerships for Student Achievement Through Technology Award Recipient Meeting**

Districts awarded an Ed Tech Partnerships for Student Achievement Through Technology grant are required to attend grant award recipient meetings twice a year. At a minimum, one representative from each of the grant partners are required to attend (funded by the recipient's grant funds). The meetings will cover the basics of implementing the grant budget and strategies, the expectations for evaluation and data collection and will provide the opportunity for the recipients to meet with the outside project evaluator. The dates of these meetings will be determined after the grants are awarded.

#### **Cover Page/ Signature Page**

Complete the cover page/signature page (see enclosed) including signatures from the Authorized Representatives of the proposal school district partners (does not count against page length requirement). Include the cover page/signature page as the first page of the proposal package.





Linda McCulloch, Superintendent  
Montana Office of Public Instruction  
PO Box 202501  
Helena, Montana 59620-2501  
Toll Free: 1-888-231-9393, Local: 406-444-3095  
www.opi.state.mt.us

Enhancing Education Through Technology  
ESEA Title II, Part D  
No Child Left Behind  
Competitive Fund Application 2005-2007

**Due Date**

**Postmarked by: April 18, 2005**

Send by certified mail.

Return an original of the application and each technology plan and an additional three (3) copies of the application and each technology plan (total of 4 each) to:

Michael Hall, Specialist  
Office of Public Instruction  
PO Box 202501  
Helena, MT 59620-2501

**OPI USE**

District Name \_\_\_\_\_

County Name \_\_\_\_\_ LE \_\_\_\_\_

Page Length \_\_\_\_\_ Postmark \_\_\_\_\_

Format Requirements \_\_\_\_\_

*Original signatures are required on the application and electronic messaging may fail, thus,  
No electronic submissions will be accepted (e.g. NO facsimiles, e-mails, or disks).*

**Program Goal**

The primary goal of the Ed Tech program is to **improve student academic achievement** through the use of the technology in elementary and secondary schools. It is also designed to assist every student-regardless of race, ethnicity, income, geographical location, or disability-in becoming **technologically literate by the end of eighth grade**, and to encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with professional development and curriculum development to **promote research-based instructional methods** that can be widely replicated. Source: Guidance on the Enhancing Education Through Technology (Ed Tec) Program, U.S. Department of Education, March 11, 2002.

**Signature Information**

The Board of Trustees submitted a Common Assurances form to the Office of Public Instruction for the 2002-03 school year, and no circumstances affecting the validity of the assurances have changed since its submittal. Further, the Board of Trustees has certified that the Common Assurances for Federal Programs and Specific Program Assurances for those programs in which this district/agency participates are accepted as the basic conditions for local participation and assistance in the operation of projects under this title.

	OPI USE
Prime Applicant District _____ Signature of Authorized Representative _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Eligibility Verified
Partner Applicant District _____ Signature of Authorized Representative _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Eligibility Verified
Partner Applicant District _____ Signature of Authorized Representative _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Eligibility Verified
Partner Applicant District _____ Signature of Authorized Representative _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Eligibility Verified
Partner Applicant District _____ Signature of Representative _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Eligibility Verified
Partner Applicant District _____ Signature of Representative _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Eligibility Verified

Copy this page as needed for additional signatures.

**2005-07 ENHANCING EDUCATION THROUGH TECHNOLOGY ESEA TITLE II, PART D  
TECHNOLOGY PLAN - PAGE REFERENCE COVER SHEETS  
(One set of cover sheets per technology plan submitted)**

District Name _____ CO _____ LE _____			
Technology Plan Elements	Ed Tech Reference	E-Rate Reference	Technology Plan Page References
<b>I. Goals and Strategies for Use of Technology and Telecommunication</b>	Ed Tech A, B	E-Rate 1A, 1B, 1C, 1D	
A. Goals (Multi-year, three years minimum aligned with state OPI Ed Tech Plan)	Ed Tech B	E-Rate 1C	SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "I.A."
B. Academic Achievement, aligned with 5YCEP goals	Ed Tech A, B		SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "I.B."
C. Student and Teacher Technology Literacy	Ed Tech A	E-Rate 1A, 1B, 1D	SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "I.C."
<b>II. Strategies (realistic)</b>	Ed Tech C, D, H, I, J, K	E-Rate 1A, 1B, 1C	
A. Promotion of research based Curricula and Teaching Strategies that Integrate Technology	Ed Tech D	E-Rate 1A, 1B	SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "II. A."
1. Based on a review of relevant research	Ed Tech D		SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "II. A. 1."
2. Aligned to Montana Content and Performance Standards	Ed Tech D		SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "II. A. 2."
3. Proven to improve student academic achievement	Ed Tech D		SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "II. A. 3."
B. Access for teachers and students	Ed Tech C	E-Rate 1A, 1B	SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "II. B."
C. Innovative instructional delivery strategies	Ed Tech I		SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "II. C."
D. Timeline (three years minimum)	Ed Tech H	E-Rate 1C	SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "II. D."
E. Parent Involvement and communication	Ed Tech J	E-Rate 1A, 1B	SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "II.E."
F. Adult Literacy and Adult Education	Ed Tech K		SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "II. F."
<b>III. Professional Development (data driven, ongoing, articulated for a minimum of three years)</b>	Ed Tech A, C, D, E, I, M	E-Rate 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D	
A. Teacher technology proficiency	Ed Tech A, C, E	E-Rate 2C, 2D	SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "III. A."
B. Teachers technology use and integration	Ed Tech A, C, E	E-Rate 2C, 2D	SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "III. B."
C. Resources to support professional development	Ed Tech A, C, E, M	E-Rate 2A, 2B	SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "III. C."

D.	Training in technology based delivery of specialized and rigorous academic content	Ed Tech A, C, E, I	E-Rate 2A, 2B	SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "III. D."
E.	Other			SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "III. E."
IV. Assessment of Needs (including inventory and replacement schedule articulated for a minimum of three years)		Ed Tech F, H, M	E-Rate 3A, 3B, 3C, 3D	
A.	Hardware	Ed Tech F, H, M	E-Rate 3A, 3C, 3D	SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "IV. A."
1.	Compatibility with existing hardware	Ed Tech F, H, M	E-Rate 3A, 3C, 3D	SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "IV. A. 1."
B.	Software	Ed Tech F, H, M	E-Rate 3A, 3C, 3D	SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "IV. B."
1.	Compatibility with existing hardware and software	Ed Tech F, H, M	E-Rate 3B, 3C, 3D	SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "IV. B. 1."
C.	Telecommunications	Ed Tech F, H, M	E-Rate 3A, 3C, 3D	SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "IV. C."
D.	Other services	Ed Tech F, H	E-Rate 3A, 3B	SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "IV. D."
V. Budget (detailed for a minimum of three years)		Ed Tech G, Ed Tech Guidance	E-Rate 4A, 4B	
A.	Demonstrated sufficiency to support the plan (total budget, explanation of expenditures)	Ed Tech G	E-Rate 4A, 4B	SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "V. A."
B.	Document coordination of funds from all sources	Ed Tech G	E-Rate 4A, 4B	SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "V. B."
C.	Document that federal funds utilized will supplement and not supplant (Ed Tech program requirement)	Ed Tech Guidance		SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "V. C."
VI. Evaluation and Accountability		Ed Tech L	E-Rate 5A	
A.	Analysis of student academic achievement data	Ed Tech L	E-Rate 5A	SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "VI. A."
B.	Analysis of student technological proficiency data	Ed Tech L	E-Rate 5A	SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "VI. B."

C.	Analysis of teacher technological proficiency data	Ed Tech L	E-Rate 5A	SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "VI. C."
D.	Analysis of teacher technology use and integration into curriculum and instruction data	Ed Tech L	E-Rate 5A	SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "VI. D."
E.	Ongoing analysis of hardware, software, and telecommunication needs	Ed Tech L	E-Rate 5A	SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "VI. E."
F.	Evaluation timeline including plan revision and school board approval	Ed Tech L	E-Rate 5A	SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "VI. F."
G.	Compliance with Children's Internet Protection Act (CIPA) (E-Rate and Ed Tech program requirements)	Ed Tech L	E-Rate 5A	SEE PAGE (S) _____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "VI. G."

**Enhancing Education Through Technology - 2005-07 Competitive Technology Grants Application**  
**APPLICATION EVALUATION RUBRIC**

<b>OPI USE: LE: _____ CO: _____ District Name _____ Review Code: _____</b>				
<b>ITEM</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Proposal Abstract</b>	<b>Not Scored</b>	<b>Not Scored</b>	<b>Not Scored</b>	<b>Not Scored</b>
<b>Partnerships</b> <b>6 Points Possible</b> (3 x a weight of 2)	Proposal does not have partnerships included.	Proposal includes partnerships, however, the roles of each partner and benefits to each partner are not clear.	Roles of each partner and the benefits to each partner are clear.	Roles of each partner and the benefits to each partner are clearly detailed and are integral to accomplishing the project.
<b>Strategies to Meet Objectives</b> <b>9 Points Possible</b> (3 x a weight of 3)	Strategies do not support the objective.	Strategies show some support for the objective.	Strategies clearly support the achievement of the objective.  Strategies are supported by research.	Strategies clearly support the achievement of the objective.  Strategies are supported by scientifically based research.
<b>Baseline Data</b> <b>6 Points Possible</b> (3 x a weight of 2)	Proposal does not include baseline data.	Proposal includes baseline data; however, the data is not clearly linked to the objectives.	Proposal includes baseline data aligned with objectives.	Proposal includes baseline data aligned with the objectives, strategies and anticipated outcomes.
<b>Timeline</b> <b>3 Points Possible</b>	Timeline is not included.	Timeline is vague and does not clearly outline the project activities.	Timeline details the project activities.	Timeline clearly and specifically details the significant project activities.
<b>Professional Development Strategies</b> <b>6 Points Possible</b> (3 x a weight of 2)	Professional development strategies do not support the objectives.	Professional development strategies support the objectives but are not aligned to the technology plan and/or Five-Year Comprehensive Education plan.	Professional development strategies support the objectives and are aligned to the technology plan and/or Five-Year Comprehensive Education plan.	Professional development strategies clearly support the objectives and show strong alignment with and support of the technology plan and Five-Year Comprehensive Education plan.
<b>Student Academic Achievement</b> <b>9 Points Possible</b> (3 x a weight of 3)	Proposal is not clear on how the project will improve student academic achievement through the use of technology.	Improvement of student academic achievement may result through the use of technology.	Improvement of student academic achievement will result through the use of technology.	Project utilizes scientifically based research strategies that will result in improved student academic achievement through the use of technology.

OPI USE: LE: _____ CO: _____ District Name _____ Review Code: _____				
ITEM	0	1	2	3
<b>Relevant Research Supporting the Strategies</b> <b>6 Points Possible</b> (3 x a weight of 2)	Research is not cited.	Research cited is anecdotal and not scientifically based.  Research does not clearly support the proposed strategies.	Research cited supports the proposed strategies and is scientifically based.	Research cited supports the proposed strategies, is scientifically based and includes multiple studies that support the strategies.
<b>Strategies for the Development of Regional Technology Networks</b> <b>9 Points Possible</b> (3 x a weight of 3)	Proposal is not clear on how the project will develop the Regional Technology Network.	Proposal provides some information on the development of the Regional Technology Network but does not specify activities and a timeline.	Proposal provides information on the development of the Regional Technology Network and specifies the activities and timeline.	Proposal articulates a strong, clearly detailed plan and timeline for the development of the Regional Technology Network.
<b>Evaluation Plan</b>  <b>9 Points Possible</b> (3 x a weight of 3)	Proposal does not articulate a plan for evaluation beyond the baseline and growth data required for the objectives.	Proposal articulates a limited plan for evaluation beyond the baseline and growth data required for the objectives.	Proposal articulates a detailed plan for evaluation beyond the baseline and growth data required for the objectives including student academic achievement, impact on teachers, administrators and parents.	Proposal articulates a strong and clearly detailed plan for evaluation beyond the baseline and growth data required for the objectives including student academic achievement and impact on teachers, administrators and parents.
<b>Alignment: Five-Year Comprehensive Education Plan, ESEA Title II, Part D formula funds and Technology Plans</b> <b>6 Points Possible</b> (3 x a weight of 2)	Proposal does not include information on how the Five-Year Comprehensive Education plan, ESEA Title II, Part D formula funds, and district technology plans support, or are supported by, the project.	References are made to the Five-Year Comprehensive Education plan, ESEA Title II, Part D funds and/or district technology plans but does not address how the project aligns with, and supports them.	Five-Year Comprehensive Education plan, ESEA Title II, Part D formula funds and technology plans are referenced with details on how the project aligns with, and supports them.	Five-Year Comprehensive Education plan, ESEA Title II, Part D formula funds plans are referenced with specific details illustrating the supporting relationship developed through the implementation of the proposal.
<b>Budget Justification</b>  <b>6 Points Possible</b> (3 x a weight of 2)	Budget items are not connected to the project strategies.  Budget does not indicate alignment with ESEA Title II, Part D formula and other NCLB funds.	Budget items vaguely connect to the project strategies.  Budget indicates alignment with ESEA Title II, Part D and other NCLB funds but connection to project strategies is unclear.	Budget items support project strategies.  Budget is aligned with ESEA Title II, Part D and other NCLB funds.	Budget items clearly support project strategies and are reasonable and sufficient to achieve the stated goals.  Budget is clearly aligned with ESEA Title II, Part D and other NCLB funds and supports the project strategies.

OPI USE: LE: _____ CO: _____ District Name _____ ReviewCode: _____				
ITEM	0	1	2	3
<b>Quality of Technology Mentor</b>  <b>6 Points Possible</b> (3 x a weight of 2)	Mentor qualifications (mentors-at-large and teacher education program faculty mentors) are not included or do not indicate special expertise related to the proposal goals and activities.	Mentor qualifications (mentors at-large and teacher education program faculty mentors) are included and indicate minimal expertise related to the proposal goals and activities.	Mentor qualifications (mentors at-large and teacher education program faculty mentors) are included and indicate expertise related to the proposal goals and activities.  Mentor qualifications indicate capacity and willingness to assist the proposal achieve the proposed goals.	Mentor qualifications (mentors at-large and teacher education program faculty mentors) are included and indicate special expertise related to the proposal goals and activities.  Mentor qualifications indicate strong capacity and willingness to assist the proposal achieve the proposed goals.
<b>Quality of Key Personal for the Internal Evaluation</b> <b>6 points possible</b> (3 x a weight of 2)	Internal Evaluator qualifications are not included or do not indicate expertise related to grant evaluation.	Internal Evaluator qualifications are included and indicate minimal expertise related to grant evaluation.	Internal Evaluator qualifications are included and indicate appropriate skills and expertise in grant evaluation.	Internal Evaluator qualifications are included and indicate strong skills and expertise in grant evaluation.

# Enhancing Education Through Technology – Competitive Funds Application

## TECHNOLOGY PLAN EVALUATION RUBRIC 2005 - 2007

<b>Rubric Scoring</b> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: flex-start;"> <div style="width: 40%;"> <p>0      Information is absent for the criteria</p> <p>1      Information is incomplete for the criteria</p> <p>2      Information provided meets or exceeds</p> </div> <div style="width: 55%;"> <p>District Name _____</p> <p>CO _____ LE _____</p> <p>Date _____ Review Code _____</p> </div> </div>						
Technology Plan Elements	Ed Tech Reference	E-Rate Reference	0	1	2	Comments
<b>I.</b> Goals and Strategies for Use of Technology and Telecommunication	Ed Tech A, B	E-Rate 1A, 1B, 1C, 1D				
A.    Goals (Multi-year, three years minimum aligned with state OPI Ed Tech Plan)	Ed Tech B	E-Rate 1C				
B.    Academic Achievement, aligned with 5YCEP goals	Ed Tech A, B					
C.    Student and Teacher Technology Literacy	Ed Tech A	E-Rate 1A, 1B, 1D				
<b>II.</b> Strategies (realistic)	Ed Tech C, D, H, I, J, K	E-Rate 1A, 1B, 1C				
A.    Promotion of research based Curricula and Teaching Strategies that Integrate Technology	Ed Tech D	E-Rate 1A, 1B				
1.    Based on a review of relevant research	Ed Tech D					
2.    Aligned to Montana Content and Performance Standards	Ed Tech D					
3.    Proven to improve student academic achievement	Ed Tech D					
B.    Access for teachers and students	Ed Tech C	E-Rate 1A, 1B				
C.    Innovative instructional delivery strategies	Ed Tech I					
D.    Timeline (three years minimum)	Ed Tech H	E-Rate 1C				
E.    Parent Involvement and communication	Ed Tech J	E-Rate 1A, 1B				
F.    Adult Literacy and Adult Education	Ed Tech K					
<b>III.</b> Professional Development (data driven, ongoing, articulated for a minimum of three years)	Ed Tech A, C, D, E, I, M	E-Rate 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D				
A.    Teacher technology proficiency	Ed Tech A, C, E	E-Rate 2C, 2D				
B.    Teachers technology use and integration	Ed Tech A, C, E	E-Rate 2C, 2D				
C.    Resources to support professional development	Ed Tech A, C, E, M	E-Rate 2A, 2B				



District Name _____ CO _____ LE _____ Date _____ Review Code _____			<b>Technology Plan Evaluation Rubric – page 2</b>			
Technology Plan Elements	Ed Tech Reference	E-Rate Reference	0	1	2	Comments
D. Training in technology based delivery of specialized and rigorous academic content	Ed Tech A, C, E, I	E-Rate 2A, 2B				
E. Other						Not Scored
<b>IV.</b> Assessment of Needs (including inventory and replacement schedule articulated for a minimum of three years)	Ed Tech F, H, M	E-Rate 3A, 3B, 3C, 3D				
A. Hardware	Ed Tech F, H, M	E-Rate 3A, 3C, 3D				
1. Compatibility with existing hardware	Ed Tech F, H, M	E-Rate 3A, 3C, 3D				
B. Software	Ed Tech F, H, M	E-Rate 3A, 3C, 3D				
1. Compatibility with existing hardware and software	Ed Tech F, H, M	E-Rate 3B, 3C, 3D				
C. Telecommunications	Ed Tech F, H, M	E-Rate 3A, 3C, 3D				
D. Other services	Ed Tech F, H	E-Rate 3A, 3B				
<b>V.</b> Budget (detailed for a minimum of three years)	Ed Tech G, Ed Tech Guidance	E-Rate 4A, 4B				
A. Demonstrated sufficiency to support the plan (Total budget, explanation of expenditures)	Ed Tech G	E-Rate 4A, 4B				
B. Document coordination of funds from all sources	Ed Tech G	E-Rate 4A, 4B				
C. Document that federal funds utilized will supplement and not supplant (Ed Tech program requirement)	Ed Tech Guidance					
<b>VI.</b> Evaluation and Accountability	Ed Tech L	E-Rate 5A				
A. Analysis of student academic achievement data	Ed Tech L	E-Rate 5A				
B. Analysis of student technological proficiency data	Ed Tech L	E-Rate 5A				
C. Analysis of teacher technological proficiency data	Ed Tech L	E-Rate 5A				

District Name _____ CO _____ LE _____ Date _____ Review Code _____				<b>Technology Plan Evaluation Rubric – page 3</b>			
Technology Plan Elements		Ed Tech Reference	E-Rate Reference	0	1	2	Comments
D.	Analysis of teacher technology use and integration into curriculum and instruction data	Ed Tech L	E-Rate 5A				
E.	Ongoing analysis of hardware, software, and telecommunication needs	Ed Tech L	E-Rate 5A				
F.	Evaluation timeline including plan revision and school board approval	Ed Tech L	E-Rate 5A				
G.	Compliance with Children's Internet Protection Act (CIPA) (E-Rate and Ed Tech program requirements)	Ed Tech L	E-Rate 5A				

**2004- 05 Enhancing Education Through Technology—PSATT Competitive Funds Application  
EVALUATION RUBRIC SCORE COMPILATION WORKSHEET FOR OPI USE**

LE: _____ CO: _____ District Name: _____ Review Code: _____				
Completed Applications Must Include:			Potential Score	Review Score
Signature Page			Not Scored	
Abstract	Items included in the page length requirement.	Not Scored		
Partnerships		6		
Strategies to Meet all Objectives		9		
Baseline Data		6		
Timeline		3		
Professional Development Strategies		6		
Student Academic Achievement		9		
Relevant Research Supporting the Strategies		6		
Strategies for the Development of the Regional Service Network		9		
Evaluation Plan		9		
Alignment to Five-Year Comprehensive Education Plan, ESEA Title II, Part D formula grant funds, and the District Technology Plan.		6		
Budget/Justification		6		
Quality of Technology Mentors		6		
Quality of Key Personnel for the Internal Evaluation	6			
Subtotal:				
Technology plans from all participating school districts (each submitted with a "Technology Plan-Page Reference Cover Sheets").			8	
Partner District #1 _____ Score _____ /4 Partner District #2 _____ Score _____ /4 Partner District #3 _____ Score _____ /4 Partner District #4 _____ Score _____ /4 Partner District #5 _____ Score _____ /4 Partner District #6 _____ Score _____ /4 Partner District #7 _____ Score _____ /4 Partner District #8 _____ Score _____ /4  <div style="text-align: right;">Total Score from above _____</div> <div style="text-align: right;">Divided by # of plans required for the proposal - # of Plans _____</div> <div style="text-align: right;">Total Adjusted Technology Plan Score for the Proposal _____</div>				
Technological need documentation for school district(s) meets minimum qualifications? District 1 _____, District 2 _____, District 3 _____, District 4 _____, District 5 _____ District 6 _____, District 7 _____.			Yes/No	
Application Format/Page Length requirements are met? District 1 _____, District 2 _____, District 3 _____, District 4 _____, District 5 _____ District 6 _____, District 7 _____.			Yes/No	
Bonus Points for greater than 50 percent of budget allocated to Professional Development.			15	
Bonus Points for included districts that received less than Average ESEA Title II, Part D Allocation in the 2004-05 school year. * District 1 _____, District 2 _____, District 3 _____, District 4 _____, District 5 _____ District 6 _____, District 7 _____.			5 each per identified districts.	
<b>Application Possible Points:</b> Narrative <b>87 points</b> Technology Plans <b>8 points</b> Professional Development Bonus <b>15 points</b> <b>105 points</b> + Low Allocation bonus points*			<div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div> <b>Total Application Score</b>	

## **Recommended Resources**

**Metiri**, (<http://www.metiri.com>)

“Looking to inform your decision-making about technology with sound, reliable research? Finding it difficult to locate research aligned to your interests, and even more difficult to know which research findings are significant and which are not?”

Metiri Group's Technology Solutions that Work (TSW) database puts research at your fingertips, providing an in-depth, unbiased analysis of research on technology solutions and software designed for K-12 schools.”

Metiri Web Site

**CARET**, (<http://caret.iste.org/>)

“CARET bridges education technology research to practice by offering research-based answers to critical questions.”

CARET Web Site

**What Works Clearinghouse**, (<http://www.whatworks.ed.gov/>)

“On an ongoing basis, the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) collects, screens, and identifies studies of the effectiveness of educational interventions (programs, products, practices, and policies). We review the studies that have the strongest design, and report on the strengths and weaknesses of those studies against the WWC Evidence Standards so that you know what the best [scientific evidence](#) has to say.”

What Works Clearinghouse Web Site

**Northwest Regional Education Laboratory –(NWREL)**, (<http://www.nwrel.org/index.html>)

“The Northwest Regional Education Laboratory improves educational results for children, youth, and adults by providing research and development assistance in delivering equitable, high-quality educational programs. The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL) provides research and development assistance to education, government, community agencies, business, and labor. NWREL's [primary service area](#) is the Northwest states of [Alaska](#), [Idaho](#), [Montana](#), [Oregon](#), and [Washington](#). ”

NWREL Web Site

**Northwest Educational Technology Consortium (NETC)** - (<http://www.netc.org/>)

“The Northwest Educational Technology Consortium (NETC) has been providing services and products in the Northwest since 1995. The consortium is made up of the state education agencies from Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington, and the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory in Portland, Oregon. NETC is one of the network of 10 Regional Technology in Education Consortia in the U.S. and receives funding from the U.S. Department of Education.”

NETC Web Site

**Network of Regional Technology in Education Consortiums**, (<http://www.rtec.org/>)

“The Regional Technology in Education Consortia (R\*TEC) program is established to help states, local educational agencies, teachers, school library and media personnel, administrators, and other education entities successfully integrate technologies into kindergarten through 12th grade (K-12) classrooms, library media centers, and other educational settings, including adult literacy centers.”

RTEC Web Site

# Partnerships for Student Achievement Through Technology

## PSATT Competitive Grants 2005-07

### Prospective Technology Plan Reader Instructions

Technology plan reading and scoring is an excellent professional development activity for individuals interested in improving their local technology plan and/or who plan on competing for technology-based grant funds in the future. Readers experience working in teams to review technology plans submitted with the PSATT grant applications submitted by Montana school districts.

The review process begins with training in the grant program, rating criteria, and an inter-rater reliability activity, followed by one and one-half days of technology plan reviews (amount of time depends upon the number of technology plans to be reviewed). To ensure reliability in scoring, it is imperative that all reviewers participate in the complete review session that will take place in Helena on April 21-22, 2005.

The Office of Public Instruction will reimburse participants at state rates for substitute teacher fees, mileage, meals and accommodations while in attendance.

Many prospective technology plan readers are associated with one or more of the partners applying for funds. While this **WILL NOT** disqualify the prospective reader from participating in the grant reading, be assured that the reader will not be assigned to read any technology plans associated with any grants that might be seen as a conflict of interest and thus create a problem with impartiality.

To avoid any conflicts of interests, please indicate on the nomination form any school, district or partnership for which you or your district:

- Have assisted in the preparation of an Ed Tech competitive partnership grant proposal,
- Have supported their efforts to obtain Ed Tech or competitive partnership grant proposal, or
- Intend to participate in any way in proposed Ed Tech competitive grant activities.

Partnerships for Student Achievement Through Technology

**Competitive Grants 2005-07**

**Prospective Technology Plan Reader Nomination Form**  
**(One form per person)**

April 21-22, 2005

Montana Office of Public Instruction  
1300 11th Avenue, Conference Room, Helena, Montana

Name (Please Print)

Organization

Address

City

State

ZIP Code

Telephone Number

Fax Number

E-mail Address

Please refer to the information on the previous page and respond to the following statements:

1. ☐ In this competition, I, or my school district, have assisted in the preparation of a proposal and will participate in some way in proposed grant activities or have otherwise supported in the efforts to obtain grant funding for the following school districts:  
  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
2. ☐ I have no connection with any proposals.
3. ☐ I would like to participate in the technology plan reading activities. I understand I must be present both days in their entirety.

**PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM BY APRIL 1, 2005 (earlier if possible) TO:**

**Lorraine Burns**  
**Accreditation Division**  
**Montana Office of Public Instruction**  
**PO Box 202501 Helena, Montana 59620-2501**  
**Telephone—(406) 444-1852**  
**Facsimile—(406) 444-1373**

**Partnerships for Student Achievement Through Technology Competitive Grants**  
**Montana Office of Public Instruction**  
**Funded Through ESEA Title II, Part D - Enhancing Education Through Technology (Ed Tech) Grants**  
**District Eligibility for PSATT Grant 2005-2007**

The NCLB legislation specifies that only Local Education Agencies (LEAs) eligible for Title II, Part D funding that meet criteria for poverty (2002 census data) and Title I status or technology need are eligible to apply. Eligible districts are encouraged to work together to apply for a grant.  
 Eligibility (column 9) is determined by:

**Poverty** – Those districts identified with a poverty level that exceeds the State average of 15.84 percent (column 3).

**AND**

**Redirected Use of Funds.** Districts must not have "redirected the use of" any portion of the district ESEA Title II, Part D, Ed Tech formula funds, utilizing the authority under ESEA Title VI of the No Child Left Behind legislation (column 8). \*Districts redirecting the use of ESEA Title II, Part D funds in the 2004-2005 school year may be eligible to apply for the PSATT grant funds for the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 school years depending upon their status on the other eligibility criteria.

**AND**

**Title I.** Districts must be identified by ESEA Title I as in need of improvement or corrective action (column 6),

**OR**

**Technology Need.** Districts must have a substantial need for technology (see criteria in application package) (column 7) .

**Bonus Points.** (column 5): High poverty districts receiving an Ed Tech formula award less than the average allocation received by high poverty school districts, will receive bonus points on their application as per the NCLB legislation (see application package for more information).

	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7	Column 8	Column 9
	LEAs	Poverty Data: Districts With Greater Than Average Poverty		Bonus Point Determination: District Has High Poverty and Less Than Average TitleID Allocation (\$4430.32)		Title I Status	Technology Need: (see application for criteria - districts must individually submit data to the OPI)	Redirection Data	Eligibility
Le	Name	District's Percent of Poverty	Is District's Percent of Poverty > 15.84%?	TitleID Allocation	Is District's TitleID Allocation > \$0 and < \$4430.32?	Does District Have a Title I School In Need of Improvement or Corrective Action?	Is district High Poverty and have High Need for Technology?	Use of Ed Tech Funds Redirected to Other Title Programs?	Is District Eligible to Apply for Ed Tech Competitive Grant?
0861	Absarokee Elem	6.78%		\$955.00			NO	NO	NO
0862	Absarokee H S	5.17%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0577	Alberton K-12 Schools	17.05%	YES	\$2,811.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto1A*	UNDETERMINED
0536	Alder Elem	25.00%	YES	\$645.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto5A*	UNDETERMINED
0096	Alzada Elem	10.00%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0376	Amsterdam Elem	17.06%	YES	\$2,069.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0236	Anaconda Elem	16.77%	YES	\$11,898.00		Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
0237	Anaconda H S	12.67%		\$3,950.00			NO	NO	NO
0366	Anderson Elem	6.81%		\$519.00			NO	Per2Dto2A*	NO
0474	Arlee Elem	28.79%	YES	\$6,400.00		Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
0475	Arlee H S	15.75%		\$1,178.00			NO	NO	NO
1215	Arrowhead Elem	19.37%	YES	\$2,280.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0800	Ashland Elem	19.34%	YES	\$3,530.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto1A*	UNDETERMINED
0498	Auchard Creek Elem	53.57%	YES	\$1,314.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0502	Augusta Elem	32.00%	YES	\$2,564.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0503	Augusta H S	23.81%	YES	\$629.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0720	Avon Elem	33.33%	YES	\$968.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
1218	Ayers Elem	0.00%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0785	Bainville K-12 Schools	20.34%	YES	\$1,038.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto1A*	UNDETERMINED
0244	Baker K-12 Schools	9.90%		\$3,381.00			NO	Per2Dto1A*	NO
0455	Basin Elem	40.91%	YES	\$1,960.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0048	Bear Paw Elem	50.00%	YES	\$0.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	NO
0006	Beaverhead County H S	16.11%	YES	\$4,167.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0076	Belfry K-12 Schools	13.33%		\$1,011.00			NO	NO	NO
0368	Belgrade Elem	10.87%		\$9,602.00			NO	NO	NO
0369	Belgrade H S	5.85%		\$1,733.00			NO	NO	NO
0112	Belt Elem	13.10%		\$1,833.00			NO	Per2Dto1A*	NO
0113	Belt H S	13.16%		\$771.00			NO	NO	NO
0171	Benton Lake Elem	20.00%	YES	\$0.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	NO
0692	Biddle Elem	11.11%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0380	Big Dry Creek Elem	12.50%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0137	Big Sandy Elem	13.51%		\$1,330.00			NO	NO	NO
0138	Big Sandy H S	14.68%		\$1,037.00			NO	NO	NO
0865	Big Timber Elem	12.28%		\$2,552.00			NO	NO	NO
0330	Bigfork Elem	14.21%		\$5,016.00			NO	Per2Dto1A*	NO
0331	Bigfork H S	12.96%		\$2,233.00			NO	NO	NO
0965	Billings Elem	15.21%		\$106,764.00		Yes	NO	NO	NO
0966	Billings H S	7.46%		\$28,277.00		Yes	NO	NO	NO
0789	Birney Elem	7.69%		\$117.00			NO	NO	NO
0215	Bloomfield Elem	41.18%	YES	\$167.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto1A*	UNDETERMINED
0968	Blue Creek Elem	5.88%		\$2,291.00			NO	Per2Dto1A*	NO
1220	Blue Sky K-12 Schools	13.39%		\$801.00			NO	NO	NO
0590	Bonner Elem	4.67%		\$2,914.00			NO	NO	NO
0456	Boulder Elem	18.15%	YES	\$3,311.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto1A*	UNDETERMINED
0425	Box Elder Elem	25.00%	YES	\$1,544.00	YES	Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
0426	Box Elder H S	24.24%	YES	\$61.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0070	Boyd Elem	19.30%	YES	\$735.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto5A*	UNDETERMINED
0350	Bozeman Elem	12.17%		\$22,879.00			NO	NO	NO
0351	Bozeman H S	7.21%		\$5,743.00			NO	NO	NO
0682	Brady K-12 Schools	8.00%		\$219.00			NO	Per2Dto1A*	NO
0059	Bridger K-12 Schools	21.96%	YES	\$2,831.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0705	Broadus Elem	14.21%		\$2,111.00			NO	NO	NO
0978	Broadview Elem	5.61%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0979	Broadview H S	17.95%	YES	\$0.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	NO

	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7	Column 8	Column 9
	LEAs	Poverty Data: Districts With Greater Than Average Poverty		Bonus Point Determination: District Has High Poverty and Less Than Average TitleID Allocation (\$4430.32)		Title I Status	Technology Need: (see application for criteria - districts must individually submit data to the OPI)	Redirection Data	Eligibility
Le	Name	District's Percent of Poverty	Is District's Percent of Poverty > 15.84%?	TitleID Allocation	Is District's TitleID Allocation > \$0 and < \$4430.32?	Does District Have a Title I School In Need of Improvement or Corrective Action?	Is district High Poverty and have High Need for Technology?	Use of Ed Tech Funds Redirected to Other Title Programs?	Is District Eligible to Apply for Ed Tech Competitive Grant?
0782	Brockton Elem	39.57%	YES	\$4,481.00		Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
0783	Brockton H S	36.17%	YES	\$1,312.00	YES	Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
0749	Brorson Elem	0.00%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0400	Browning Elem	37.94%	YES	\$42,018.00		Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
0401	Browning H S	24.50%	YES	\$9,128.00		Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
0840	Butte Elem	19.10%	YES	\$41,950.00		Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
1212	Butte H S	11.98%		\$10,289.00			NO	NO	NO
0889	Bynum Elem	22.58%	YES	\$91.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto5A*	UNDETERMINED
0813	Camas Prairie Elem	13.64%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0969	Canyon Creek Elem	9.54%		\$1,429.00			NO	Per2Dto5A*	NO
0458	Cardwell Elem	10.64%		\$133.00			NO	Per2Dto1A*	NO
0097	Carter County H S	11.36%		\$1,104.00			NO	NO	NO
0159	Carter Elem	8.33%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0101	Cascade Elem	14.57%		\$2,056.00			NO	Per2Dto1A*	NO
0102	Cascade H S	11.83%		\$926.00			NO	NO	NO
0317	Cayuse Prairie Elem	12.50%		\$1,429.00			NO	Per2Dto2A*	NO
0104	Centerville Elem	24.00%	YES	\$3,368.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0105	Centerville H S	15.58%		\$670.00			NO	NO	NO
1205	Charlo Elem	28.30%	YES	\$3,449.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto5A*	UNDETERMINED
1206	Charlo H S	26.13%	YES	\$1,717.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0510	Chester Elem	13.53%		\$2,239.00			NO	NO	NO
0511	Chester H S	13.89%		\$1,466.00			NO	NO	NO
0028	Chinook Elem	24.36%	YES	\$3,947.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0029	Chinook H S	14.11%		\$1,439.00			NO	NO	NO
0883	Choteau Elem	19.38%	YES	\$4,826.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0884	Choteau H S	14.46%		\$1,601.00			NO	NO	NO
0547	Circle Elem	19.53%	YES	\$2,278.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0548	Circle H S	20.69%	YES	\$1,007.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0452	Clancy Elem	2.04%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0032	Cleveland Elem	10.00%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0595	Clinton Elem	20.76%	YES	\$3,123.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0387	Cohagen Elem	6.67%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0796	Colstrip Elem	11.24%		\$2,637.00		Yes	NO	NO	NO
0797	Colstrip H S	5.00%		\$542.00			NO	NO	NO
0312	Columbia Falls Elem	20.63%	YES	\$20,899.00		Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
0313	Columbia Falls H S	19.56%	YES	\$8,606.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0848	Columbus Elem	10.41%		\$3,406.00			NO	NO	NO
0849	Columbus H S	6.11%		\$727.00			NO	NO	NO
0674	Conrad Elem	12.08%		\$3,662.00			NO	NO	NO
0675	Conrad H S	8.33%		\$1,098.00			NO	NO	NO
0617	Cooke City Elem	20.00%	YES	\$0.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	NO
0731	Corvallis K-12 Schools	22.35%	YES	\$18,758.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0182	Cottonwood Elem	5.56%		\$119.00			NO	Per2Dto5A*	NO
0359	Cottonwood Elem	6.45%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0445	Cottonwood Elem	21.82%	YES	\$669.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto2A*	UNDETERMINED
0497	Craig Elem	69.70%	YES	\$3,509.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0316	Creston Elem	9.68%		\$900.00			NO	NO	NO
0777	Culbertson Elem	3.20%		\$177.00			NO	Per2Dto1A*	NO
0778	Culbertson H S	4.84%		\$59.00			NO	NO	NO
0192	Custer County H S	11.34%		\$3,628.00			NO	NO	NO
0975	Custer K-12 Schools	7.25%		\$107.00			NO	NO	NO
0402	Cut Bank Elem	26.49%	YES	\$10,376.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0403	Cut Bank H S	18.82%	YES	\$2,707.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0740	Darby K-12 Schools	22.35%	YES	\$10,843.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0424	Davey Elem	14.29%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0207	Dawson H S	13.16%		\$3,597.00			NO	NO	NO
1195	Deep Creek Elem	15.38%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
1193	Deer Creek Elem	8.87%		\$70.00			NO	Per2Dto1A*	NO
0712	Deer Lodge Elem	17.85%	YES	\$6,780.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0307	Deer Park Elem	10.28%		\$1,229.00			NO	Per2Dto2A*	NO
0264	Deerfield Elem	0.00%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0281	Denton Elem	13.48%		\$728.00			NO	NO	NO
0282	Denton H S	22.50%	YES	\$67.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
9034	Dept of Corrections-Youth						NO	NO	NO
0592	DeSmet Elem	31.97%	YES	\$3,315.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto5A*	UNDETERMINED
0005	Dillon Elem	17.79%	YES	\$8,247.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0843	Divide Elem	13.04%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0809	Dixon Elem	49.15%	YES	\$2,066.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0647	Dodson Elem	25.93%	YES	\$1,648.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0648	Dodson H S	33.33%	YES	\$936.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0419	Drummond Elem	13.68%		\$1,012.00			NO	Per2Dto4A*	NO
0420	Drummond H S	19.61%	YES	\$693.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0671	Dupuyer Elem	40.58%	YES	\$2,920.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto1A*	UNDETERMINED
0893	Dutton K-12 Schools	8.20%		\$1,441.00			NO	NO	NO
0404	East Glacier Park Elem	22.47%	YES	\$1,071.00	YES	Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
0492	East Helena Elem	7.74%		\$5,915.00			NO	NO	NO
0073	Edgar Elem	25.00%	YES	\$627.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto5A*	UNDETERMINED
0087	Ekalaka Elem	21.00%	YES	\$1,741.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0972	Elder Grove Elem	6.05%		\$979.00			NO	NO	NO
0719	Elliston Elem	27.66%	YES	\$746.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0981	Elysian Elem	9.38%		\$76.00			NO	Per2Dto1A*	NO
0546	Ennis K-12 Schools	8.82%		\$1,577.00			NO	NO	NO
0527	Eureka Elem	24.54%	YES	\$8,022.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0339	Evergreen Elem	17.10%	YES	\$8,760.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0890	Fairfield Elem	6.08%		\$649.00			NO	Per2Dto2A*	NO
0891	Fairfield H S	10.16%		\$860.00			NO	NO	NO
0308	Fair-Mont-Egan Elem	10.69%		\$611.00			NO	Per2Dto1A*	NO



	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7	Column 8	Column 9
	LEAs	Poverty Data: Districts With Greater Than Average Poverty		Bonus Point Determination: District Has High Poverty and Less Than Average TitleID Allocation (\$4430.32)		Title I Status	Technology Need: (see application for criteria - districts must individually submit data to the OPI)	Redirection Data	Eligibility
Le	Name	District's Percent of Poverty	Is District's Percent of Poverty > 15.84%?	TitleID Allocation	Is District's TitleID Allocation > \$0 and < \$4430.32?	Does District Have a Title I School In Need of Improvement or Corrective Action?	Is district High Poverty and have High Need for Technology?	Use of Ed Tech Funds Redirected to Other Title Programs?	Is District Eligible to Apply for Ed Tech Competitive Grant?
0750	Fairview Elem	17.31%	YES	\$2,248.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto1A*	UNDETERMINED
0751	Fairview H S	15.07%		\$670.00			NO	NO	NO
0259	Fergus H S	10.18%		\$2,395.00			NO	NO	NO
0853	Fishtail Elem	2.63%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0311	Flathead H S	10.50%		\$11,845.00			NO	NO	NO
0200	Flaxville K-12 Schools	18.18%	YES	\$47.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto5A*	UNDETERMINED
0743	Florence-Carlton K-12 Schls	5.94%		\$2,813.00			NO	NO	NO
0790	Forsyth Elem	14.70%		\$3,060.00			NO	Per2Dto5A*	NO
0791	Forsyth H S	8.70%		\$694.00			NO	NO	NO
0133	Fort Benton Elem	7.56%		\$1,963.00			NO	Per2Dto5A*	NO
0134	Fort Benton H S	10.20%		\$938.00			NO	NO	NO
0529	Fortine Elem	1.54%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0927	Frazer Elem	55.86%	YES	\$6,242.00		Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
0928	Frazer H S	43.14%	YES	\$1,728.00	YES	Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
0599	Frenchtown K-12 Schools	2.62%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0786	Froid Elem	16.39%	YES	\$638.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto5A*	UNDETERMINED
0787	Froid H S	6.67%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0071	Fromberg Elem	22.63%	YES	\$1,919.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0072	Fromberg H S	22.22%	YES	\$972.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0774	Frontier Elem	12.86%		\$832.00			NO	NO	NO
0915	Galata Elem	12.00%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0364	Gallatin Gateway Elem	8.33%		\$626.00			NO	Per2Dto1A*	NO
0614	Gardiner Elem	4.82%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
1191	Gardiner H S	18.97%	YES	\$575.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto5A*	UNDETERMINED
0378	Garfield County H S	29.23%	YES	\$1,252.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0718	Garrison Elem	50.00%	YES	\$64.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0153	Geraldine Elem	6.67%		\$98.00			NO	Per2Dto1A*	NO
0154	Geraldine H S	6.98%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0472	Geyser Elem	29.17%	YES	\$51.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto1A*	UNDETERMINED
0473	Geyser H S	19.35%	YES	\$0.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	NO
1217	Gildford Colony Elem	28.57%	YES	\$0.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	NO
0926	Glasgow K-12 Schools	13.04%		\$6,195.00			NO	NO	NO
0206	Glendive Elem	13.88%		\$6,751.00			NO	NO	NO
0721	Gold Creek Elem	26.67%	YES	\$0.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	NO
0896	Golden Ridge Elem	22.73%	YES	\$127.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto5A*	UNDETERMINED
0003	Grant Elem	32.14%	YES	\$100.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto1A*	UNDETERMINED
0268	Grass Range Elem	21.88%	YES	\$899.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0269	Grass Range H S	30.00%	YES	\$901.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0098	Great Falls Elem	17.41%	YES	\$94,361.00		Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
0099	Great Falls H S	8.78%		\$14,846.00			NO	NO	NO
0900	Greenfield Elem	8.45%		\$301.00			NO	Per2Dto1A*	NO
0872	Greycliff Elem	8.82%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0418	Hall Elem	9.09%		\$92.00			NO	Per2Dto1A*	NO
0735	Hamilton K-12 Schools	21.36%	YES	\$19,578.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0023	Hardin Elem	29.28%	YES	\$29,324.00		Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
1189	Hardin H S	21.55%	YES	\$6,527.00		Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
0030	Harlem Elem	23.43%	YES	\$8,240.00		Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
0031	Harlem H S	19.53%	YES	\$2,140.00	YES	Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
0945	Harlowton Elem	12.41%		\$1,714.00			NO	NO	NO
0946	Harlowton H S	30.00%	YES	\$1,534.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0543	Harrison K-12 Schools	15.11%		\$1,163.00			NO	NO	NO
0427	Havre Elem	20.69%	YES	\$18,477.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0428	Havre H S	8.51%		\$2,816.00			NO	NO	NO
0078	Hawks Home Elem	18.75%	YES	\$0.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	NO
1213	Hays-Lodge Pole K-12 Schls	37.31%	YES	\$12,412.00		Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
0670	Heart Butte Elem	35.14%	YES	\$4,903.00		Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
1226	Heart Butte H S	25.35%	YES	\$1,485.00	YES	Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
0487	Helena Elem	12.18%		\$38,795.00		Yes	NO	NO	NO
0320	Helena Flats Elem	8.37%		\$933.00			NO	Per2Dto1A*	NO
0488	Helena H S	6.64%		\$9,644.00			NO	NO	NO
0586	Hellgate Elem	11.26%		\$6,433.00			NO	NO	NO
0717	Helmville Elem	18.75%	YES	\$0.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	NO
0145	Highwood Elem	18.18%	YES	\$938.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto5A*	UNDETERMINED
0146	Highwood H S	10.34%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0932	Hinsdale Elem	50.00%	YES	\$2,443.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0933	Hinsdale H S	0.00%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0469	Hobson K-12 Schools	14.71%		\$1,621.00			NO	NO	NO
0814	Hot Springs Elem	46.53%	YES	\$4,710.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0815	Hot Springs H S	28.33%	YES	\$879.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0983	Huntley Project K-12 Schools	14.59%		\$6,177.00			NO	NO	NO
0923	Hysham K-12 Schools	14.86%		\$1,730.00			NO	NO	NO
0989	Independent Elem	6.85%		\$926.00			NO	NO	NO
0014	Jackson Elem	14.81%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0457	Jefferson H S	3.06%		\$1,129.00			NO	NO	NO
0508	J-I K-12 Schools	11.96%		\$900.00			NO	NO	NO
0060	Joliet Elem	16.39%	YES	\$1,652.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0061	Joliet H S	13.00%		\$576.00			NO	NO	NO
0377	Jordan Elem	28.79%	YES	\$1,318.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto2A*	UNDETERMINED
0948	Judith Gap Elem	56.67%	YES	\$2,359.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0949	Judith Gap H S	57.14%	YES	\$1,014.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
1208	K-G Elem	19.15%	YES	\$137.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
1209	K-G HS	15.79%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0310	Kalispell Elem	9.19%		\$18,459.00			NO	NO	NO
0386	Kester Elem	0.00%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0323	Kila Elem	22.60%	YES	\$2,583.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto1A*	UNDETERMINED
0272	King Colony Elem	15.63%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0187	Kinsey Elem	20.41%	YES	\$600.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto1A*	UNDETERMINED

	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7	Column 8	Column 9
	LEAs	Poverty Data: Districts With Greater Than Average Poverty		Bonus Point Determination: District Has High Poverty and Less Than Average TitleID Allocation (\$4430.32)		Title I Status	Technology Need: (see application for criteria - districts must individually submit data to the OPI)	Redirection Data	Eligibility
Le	Name	District's Percent of Poverty	Is District's Percent of Poverty > 15.84%?	TitleID Allocation	Is District's TitleID Allocation > \$0 and < \$4430.32?	Does District Have a Title I School In Need of Improvement or Corrective Action?	Is district High Poverty and have High Need for Technology?	Use of Ed Tech Funds Redirected to Other Title Programs?	Is District Eligible to Apply for Ed Tech Competitive Grant?
0173	Kircher Elem	8.60%		\$279.00			NO	Per2Dto1A*	NO
0161	Knees Elem	21.43%	YES	\$0.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	NO
0768	Lambert Elem	37.10%	YES	\$1,996.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0769	Lambert H S	43.33%	YES	\$1,211.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0792	Lame Deer Elem	40.98%	YES	\$23,238.00		Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
1230	Lame Deer H S	35.34%	YES	\$12,289.00		Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
0367	LaMotte Elem	3.30%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0653	Landusky Elem	20.00%	YES	\$0.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	NO
0970	Laurel Elem	11.36%		\$10,021.00			NO	NO	NO
0971	Laurel H S	13.48%		\$3,713.00			NO	NO	NO
0411	Lavina K-12 Schools	27.27%	YES	\$1,089.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0568	Lennep Elem	33.33%	YES	\$0.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	NO
0258	Lewistown Elem	18.10%	YES	\$10,835.00		Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
0522	Libby K-12 Schools	22.87%	YES	\$22,908.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
1224	Liberty Elem	22.22%	YES	\$0.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	NO
0009	Lima K-12 Schools	33.33%	YES	\$2,084.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0528	Lincoln County H S	13.98%		\$2,237.00			NO	NO	NO
1221	Lincoln K-12 Schools	25.91%	YES	\$5,486.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0216	Lindsay Elem	42.22%	YES	\$3,505.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto1A*	UNDETERMINED
0612	Livingston Elem	15.82%		\$10,767.00			NO	NO	NO
0967	Lockwood Elem	7.27%		\$7,850.00			NO	NO	NO
0025	Lodge Grass Elem	35.43%	YES	\$11,178.00		Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
1190	Lodge Grass H S	31.21%	YES	\$4,507.00		Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
0588	Lolo Elem	6.58%		\$4,443.00			NO	NO	NO
0741	Lone Rock Elem	19.18%	YES	\$3,760.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0941	Lustre Elem	22.22%	YES	\$0.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	NO
1231	Luther Elem	11.32%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0370	Malmborg Elem	11.11%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0659	Malta K-12 Schools	15.16%		\$5,826.00			NO	NO	NO
0347	Manhattan Elem	14.48%		\$2,591.00			NO	NO	NO
0348	Manhattan H S	12.64%		\$1,353.00			NO	NO	NO
0341	Marion Elem	15.93%	YES	\$965.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0530	McCormick Elem	19.05%	YES	\$109.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto1A*	UNDETERMINED
0875	McLeod Elem	4.17%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0822	Medicine Lake K-12 Schools	16.67%	YES	\$2,766.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0844	Melrose Elem	18.18%	YES	\$0.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	NO
0607	Melstone Elem	31.34%	YES	\$1,459.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0608	Melstone H S	5.26%		\$49.00			NO	NO	NO
0868	Melville Elem	22.22%	YES	\$622.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto5A*	UNDETERMINED
0684	Miami Elem	21.74%	YES	\$0.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	NO
0172	Miles City Elem	18.50%	YES	\$13,227.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0583	Missoula Elem	20.69%	YES	\$71,394.00		Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
0584	Missoula H S	10.81%		\$19,968.00			NO	NO	NO
0852	Molt Elem	11.11%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0363	Monforton Elem	13.11%		\$1,744.00			NO	Per2Dto2A*	NO
9258	Mont Sch for Deaf Blind		YES				UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0460	Montana City Elem	5.07%		\$955.00			NO	NO	NO
0273	Moore Elem	19.30%	YES	\$698.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto1A*	UNDETERMINED
0274	Moore H S	7.41%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0976	Morin Elem	11.94%		\$70.00			NO	Per2Dto1A*	NO
1222	Mountain View Elem	0.00%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0937	Nashua K-12 Schools	1.44%		\$190.00			NO	Per2Dto1A*	NO
1216	North Harlem Colony Elem	0.00%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0811	Noxon Elem	18.30%	YES	\$1,867.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto1A*	UNDETERMINED
0812	Noxon H S	11.97%		\$977.00			NO	NO	NO
0857	Nye Elem	5.56%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0342	Olney-Bissell Elem	18.11%	YES	\$1,240.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0935	Opheim K-12 Schools	17.74%	YES	\$913.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0375	Ophir Elem	4.00%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0831	Outlook K-12 Schools	11.76%		\$162.00			NO	Per2Dto1A*	NO
0715	Ovando Elem	19.35%	YES	\$90.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0808	Paradise Elem	39.29%	YES	\$967.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto1A*	UNDETERMINED
0846	Park City Elem	11.40%		\$1,822.00			NO	NO	NO
0847	Park City H S	1.94%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0613	Park H S	8.70%		\$2,267.00			NO	NO	NO
0362	Pass Creek Elem	6.67%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0196	Peerless K-12 Schools	10.00%		\$42.00			NO	Per2Dto1A*	NO
0898	Pendroy Elem	34.62%	YES	\$1,510.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto5A*	UNDETERMINED
0416	Phillipsburg K-12 Schools	18.35%	YES	\$3,976.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto5A*	UNDETERMINED
0620	Pine Creek Elem	21.21%	YES	\$0.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	NO
0385	Pine Grove Elem	28.57%	YES	\$48.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto1A*	UNDETERMINED
0987	Pioneer Elem	11.83%		\$892.00			NO	NO	NO
0802	Plains Elem	29.34%	YES	\$5,301.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0803	Plains H S	9.55%		\$938.00			NO	NO	NO
0325	Pleasant Valley Elem	8.33%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
1214	Plenty Coups H S	30.65%	YES	\$1,148.00	YES	Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
0828	Plentywood K-12 Schools	8.80%		\$2,053.00			NO	Per2Dto1A*	NO
0256	Plevna K-12 Schools	15.28%		\$1,109.00			NO	NO	NO
0012	Polaris Elem	20.00%	YES	\$98.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto5A*	UNDETERMINED
0477	Polson Elem	20.68%	YES	\$12,970.00		Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
0478	Polson H S	11.78%		\$3,024.00		Yes	NO	NO	NO
0775	Poplar Elem	43.84%	YES	\$27,519.00		Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
0776	Poplar H S	33.20%	YES	\$5,960.00		Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
0589	Potomac Elem	23.62%	YES	\$1,856.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto5A*	UNDETERMINED
0706	Powder River Co Dist H S	11.22%		\$674.00			NO	NO	NO
0713	Powell County H S	11.21%		\$2,695.00		Yes	NO	NO	NO
0894	Power Elem	17.31%	YES	\$834.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED

	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7	Column 8	Column 9
	LEAs	Poverty Data: Districts With Greater Than Average Poverty		Bonus Point Determination: District Has High Poverty and Less Than Average TitleID Allocation (\$4430.32)		Title I Status	Technology Need: (see application for criteria - districts must individually submit data to the OPI)	Redirection Data	Eligibility
Le	Name	District's Percent of Poverty	Is District's Percent of Poverty > 15.84%?	TitleID Allocation	Is District's TitleID Allocation > \$0 and < \$4430.32?	Does District Have a Title I School In Need of Improvement or Corrective Action?	Is district High Poverty and have High Need for Technology?	Use of Ed Tech Funds Redirected to Other Title Programs?	Is District Eligible to Apply for Ed Tech Competitive Grant?
0895	Power H S	24.14%	YES	\$61.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0021	Pryor Elem	35.71%	YES	\$5,394.00		Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
0842	Ramsay Elem	17.11%	YES	\$1,756.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0858	Rapelje Elem	20.51%	YES	\$642.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0859	Rapelje H S	15.00%		\$47.00			NO	NO	NO
0754	Rau Elem	0.00%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0471	Raynesford Elem	15.79%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0056	Red Lodge Elem	3.87%		\$1,811.00			NO	NO	NO
0057	Red Lodge H S	13.53%		\$1,080.00			NO	NO	NO
0850	Reed Point Elem	15.58%		\$1,490.00			NO	NO	NO
0851	Reed Point H S	15.38%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0015	Reichle Elem	18.18%	YES	\$0.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	NO
0227	Richey Elem	19.23%	YES	\$808.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto1A*	UNDETERMINED
0228	Richey H S	20.00%	YES	\$0.00			UNDETERMINED		NO
0574	Ringling Elem	11.11%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0069	Roberts K-12 Schools	7.97%		\$478.00			NO	NO	NO
1207	Rocky Boy Elem	39.08%	YES	\$21,934.00		Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
1229	Rocky Boy H S	24.62%	YES	\$2,635.00	YES	Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
1199	Ronan Elem	29.57%	YES	\$21,116.00		Yes	UNDETERMINED	NO	YES
1200	Ronan H S	18.20%	YES	\$5,532.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0794	Rosebud Elem	14.81%		\$553.00			NO	NO	NO
0795	Rosebud H S	6.90%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0394	Ross Elem	66.67%	YES	\$0.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	NO
0605	Roundup Elem	25.56%	YES	\$7,573.00			UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto5A*	UNDETERMINED
0606	Roundup H S	21.50%	YES	\$3,169.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0280	Roy K-12 Schools	11.76%		\$657.00			NO	Per2Dto5A*	NO
0407	Ryegate K-12 Schools	16.67%	YES	\$1,219.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0190	S H Elem	0.00%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
1203	Saco Elem	32.76%	YES	\$1,442.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto1A*	UNDETERMINED
0657	Saco H S	13.89%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0392	Sand Springs Elem	0.00%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0747	Savage Elem	17.11%	YES	\$861.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0748	Savage H S	2.00%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0194	Scobey K-12 Schools	17.78%	YES	\$2,834.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0597	Seeley Lake Elem	13.69%		\$1,553.00			NO	Per2Dto5A*	NO
0947	Shawmut Elem	13.33%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0910	Shelby Elem	11.08%		\$3,559.00			NO	NO	NO
0911	Shelby H S	7.32%		\$811.00			NO	NO	NO
0985	Shepherd Elem	18.43%	YES	\$5,630.00			UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto1A*	UNDETERMINED
0986	Shepherd H S	9.78%		\$1,003.00			NO	NO	NO
0537	Sheridan Elem	33.59%	YES	\$3,144.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0538	Sheridan H S	13.58%		\$519.00			NO	NO	NO
1227	Shields Valley Elem	23.19%	YES	\$2,877.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
1228	Shields Valley H S	15.69%		\$1,266.00			NO	NO	NO
0745	Sidney Elem	12.22%		\$7,181.00			NO	NO	NO
0746	Sidney H S	7.89%		\$1,635.00			NO	NO	NO
0118	Simms H S	10.27%		\$1,762.00			NO	NO	NO
0324	Smith Valley Elem	19.72%	YES	\$2,308.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto2A*	UNDETERMINED
0327	Somers Elem	16.75%	YES	\$5,144.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0709	South Stacey Elem	8.33%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0288	Spring Creek Colony Elem	0.00%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0020	Spring Creek Elem	28.57%	YES	\$0.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	NO
0179	Spring Creek Elem	16.67%	YES	\$0.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	NO
0635	Springdale Elem	12.50%					NO	NO	NO
0357	Springhill Elem	7.14%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0481	St Ignatius K-12 Schools	34.93%	YES	\$14,137.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0582	St Regis K-12 Schools	27.53%	YES	\$3,707.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0464	Stanford K-12 Schools	15.29%		\$3,179.00			NO	NO	NO
0732	Stevensville Elem	15.51%		\$6,363.00			NO	NO	NO
0733	Stevensville H S	14.85%		\$3,689.00			NO	NO	NO
1225	Sun River Valley Elem	15.00%		\$2,660.00			NO	NO	NO
0903	Sunburst K-12 Schools	18.44%	YES	\$3,355.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto2A*	UNDETERMINED
0594	Sunset Elem	6.67%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0579	Superior K-12 Schools	19.43%	YES	\$3,937.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0486	Swan Lake-Salmon Elem	7.69%		\$46.00			NO	Per2Dto2A*	NO
0309	Swan River Elem	18.32%	YES	\$1,997.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0596	Swan Valley Elem	15.87%	YES	\$63.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto5A*	UNDETERMINED
0882	Sweet Grass County H S	9.68%		\$951.00			NO	NO	NO
0532	Sylvanite Elem	28.57%	YES	\$0.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	NO
0593	Target Range Elem	1.99%		\$337.00			NO	NO	NO
0726	Terry K-12 Schools	17.81%	YES	\$2,755.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0804	Thompson Falls Elem	17.73%	YES	\$3,317.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto5A*	UNDETERMINED
0805	Thompson Falls H S	26.47%	YES	\$2,731.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0360	Three Forks Elem	6.49%		\$1,407.00			NO	Per2Dto1A*	NO
0361	Three Forks H S	6.92%		\$440.00			NO	NO	NO
0055	Townsend K-12 Schools	15.68%		\$6,801.00			NO	NO	NO
0177	Trail Creek Elem	42.86%	YES	\$0.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	NO
0534	Trego Elem	7.94%		\$0.00			NO	NO	NO
0491	Trinity Elem	23.84%	YES	\$7,117.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0807	Trout Creek Elem	34.51%	YES	\$3,432.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0519	Troy Elem	32.15%	YES	\$6,836.00			UNDETERMINED	Per2Dto5A*	UNDETERMINED
0520	Troy H S	26.90%	YES	\$3,088.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0044	Turner Elem	27.45%	YES	\$1,054.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED
0045	Turner H S	27.27%	YES	\$0.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	NO
0540	Twin Bridges K-12 Schools	13.98%		\$2,831.00			NO	NO	NO
1232	Twin Buttes Elem	22.22%	YES	\$0.00			UNDETERMINED	NO	NO
0131	Ulm Elem	17.21%	YES	\$1,185.00	YES		UNDETERMINED	NO	UNDETERMINED

[illegible]